

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes 11/4/2014

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

MINUTES

Tuesday, November 4, 2014

SEVEN HILLS CONFERENCE CENTER

NOB HILL ROOM

2:00 – 5:00 p.m.

ATTENDANCE:

Alamilla Boyd, Nan		
Alvarez, Alvin	Hackenberg, Sara	
Alvarenga, Gabriela	Hammer, Mike	
Azadpur, Mohammad	Hasheminia, Hamed	Robertson, Bruce
	Hanley, Lawrence	Rosegard, Erik
Bettinger, Chris	Howard, Pamela	Steier, Saul
Carabez, Rebecca	Hoxter, Julian	Summit, Jennifer
Carleton, Troi	Hurley, Timothy	Tomalin, Jo
Clavier, Sophie	Lebuhn, Gretchen	Trogu, Pino
Cortez, Ronald	Levy, Eileen	Tumbat, Gulnur
Davila, Bridgette	Le, Mai Nhung	Vasche, Jason
Davis, Patricia	Lipps, Matt	Watanabe, Maika
Doan, Therese	Mays, Chris	Wilckzak, Cynthia
Ergul, Mehmet	Mendolla, Paul	Wong, Les
Furuse, Tae	Mitchell, Marilyn	Yoo, Grace
Gerber, Nancy	Nizardini, Richard	Yoon, Ilmi
Getz, Trevor	Pafford, Isabelle	Zink, Attila
	Pasion, Sally	

Absences: Bartscher, Patricia (abs); Carleton, Troi (exc); Chang, Sandy (abs); Collins, Robert (exc); Donohue, Patricia (exc); Ganji, Ahmad (abs); Ginwala, Cyrus (exc); Hill, Lorna (abs); Lewis, Julia (abs); Merchant, Zahira (abs); Pope, Robert (abs); Rosser, Sue (exc); Stowers, Genie (abs); Turner, Sharlana (abs); Yee-Melichar, Darlene (abs);

OPEN FLOOR PERIOD: 2:00 - 2:10 p.m.

The Open Floor Period provides an informal opportunity for faculty members to raise questions or make comments directed to Senate officers or to university administrators. Please arrive promptly at 2:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER: 2:10 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Nancy Ganner- 7 Hills- addressed the complementary water service for AS; because of the drought, they have moved to water service on request. Thanks for helping us conserve water on campus.

Brigitte Davila- VOTE!

AGENDA ITEM #1 — Approval of agenda for Nov 4, 2014 plenary session

Agenda Approved

AGENDA ITEM #2 — Minutes of October 7, 2014 plenary session

Minutes Approved

AGENDA ITEM #3— Chair's Report

1. Going back to initial pledge that we would not focus on adding levels of bureaucracy to Senate. We've all agreed to take on extra work in committees recently, the fruits of which are before us in this meeting today in the form of very fine policies.
2. Thanks for your comments to the revisions of the Strategic Plan.
3. Don't rush through agenda items; let items come to second reading that need it.
4. Informational Item- process document for name changes requires that Senate approve before going to Academic Affairs Council. Recent name changes are: School of Art, School of Cinema, School of Music; School of Theater and Dance; merger of TPW and English departments; School of Humanities and Liberal Studies. Faculty voted on these changes and approved them.
5. Please engage in discussion today, as we are a deliberative body.

AGENDA ITEM #4 — Standing Committee Reports

APC- Sen. Gerber- working with CRAC on 7th cycle standards; working on membership of UTPC and Faculty Rights Panel; discussing policies regarding merger of departments.

CRAC- Sen. Wilczak- nothing to report other than the business before us today

FAC- Sen. Hackenberg- working on electronic WPAF's

SAC- Sen. Mendolla- discussing Student Success Fees

SIC- Vasche- mission statement; staff morale on back burner; potential tasks related to Hunter's Point development

AGENDA ITEM #5 — Presentation from CSUEU representatives

Bridget McCracken, Dir. of Academic Services, Dept. Public Administration; and Kathleen Bruno, VP of chapter, UCorp.

Excellent bargaining team that represented different campuses and brought forward agreement. Two major goals: raises and protect benefits; TA ratified by membership on 10/25/14. 98% voted to ratify, which is a record number of members voting for ratification. CSU will vote on agreement at next Board of Trustees meeting on 11/13/14. Compensation will be retroactive to July 1, 2014.

Employees will see a 7% increase over next 22 months; 3, 2, and 2. This is guaranteed and not conditional on funding levels. Staff will see GSI increases, also not conditional. There will be no reopeners on any issues. If faculty receive agreement and receive larger compensation pool, they also will receive that. There are major improvements in in-range progression portion of contract. Campus IRP guidelines must be consistent with contract. Other gains are: expanded employment rights, expanded family rights for stepparents, aunts and uncles, extra five days to review annual performance evaluation, right to union representation for classification appeal meetings, new protections against loss of

positions, definitions of intermediate and per diem employees, faster response for vacation requests, and improvements in informal grievance process.

You may find the full text of the CBA at csueu.org. Documents are also in iLearn.

AGENDA ITEM #6 — Introduction of Jeanette Peralta, Resource Advocate, by Ann Sherman, AVP for Human Resources

Ann Sherman, AVP HR, introduced Jeanette Peralta, Resource Advocate, whose position is the result of work done by SIC last year under the leadership of Sen. Carleton. She will be available to help faculty who need assistance that doesn't rise to the level of labor relations concern, more "informal" methods.

Jeanette Peralta is honored and excited to be in this role, position effective 7/1/14. She will meet individually one on one or meet with groups or community to do outreach and training if there's a need based on situations that have come forth. The process is informal and extremely confidential. Email or phone at SFSU HR website; 338-8178; and peralta@sfsu.edu.

Senators thanked SIC for their hard work last year to identify the need for informal processes, and pleased that it culminated in this position. They would like materials put up on the HR website, clarifying the situations that would suggest Ms. Peralta's involvement as well as measures that would necessitate her involvement.

HR is in process of updating their website; there's a splash page on this resource, and other links as well.

AGENDA ITEM #7 — Proposal for a new program (BS, BA, and minor) in Earth and Climate Sciences, from the Curriculum Review and Approval Committee (first reading)

Sen. Wilczak, CRAC chair, moved to first reading; because it comes from CRAC, no second required.

This proposal was passed unanimously by CRAC, and reflects much thought. There is a name change from Geoscience to Earth and Climate Science. P. 14 has to do with problems in enrollment in Oceanic and Atmospheric Science, just a few students a year. The new curriculum will provide more flexibility for students as units have not changed but core has dropped number of units; consolidation of core courses by having one BS degree with three emphases. This will help with student cohesion and encouraging faculty collaboration. Concerns were voiced about losing degree that's titled Geology, now BS in Earth Sciences with emphasis in Geology; the problem was addressed and reflects current trends in their field.

Addressed problem of having BS in ES and ECS and how they differed from Geography and ENV5. Section 10, p, 21, is the best definition of how the programs function differently. P22, Sect 11, addresses why emphases and not concentrations; as they're not on the diploma. Good administrative reasons for doing this, and in response to concerns from program review and the college around better managing of resources within the department.

Concerns raised by Senators:

- Does Geology in general have national organization that has standards for ES? Is department complying if they do? There is an exam Geology students take, but this change will not impact this. So common now to have different degree names for Geology departments and it won't affect them.
- Line 540, section 12, under consultations, says that there is a consultation with ENV5 but don't see results; also, the decrease from 50-31 units, how will this affect rigor?

Sen. Wilczak, CRAC chair, responded that consultation was done with ENV5, and the committee received a letter of

support from Carlos Davidson; proposal good and don't see impacts on ENVs. Don't know how it was left out of the document. Also, total number of units hasn't changed; what's changed is what's required. There are now required units and then emphases. There will be mandatory advising for each student to ensure they meet the requirements.

Sen. Rosegard- move to second reading; second by Sen. Alvarez. Item now in second reading; arguments for or against the motion, or amendments.

Sen. Wilczak- department thought carefully about this; meets requirement for baccalaureate at the university; need to allow them to get a program that's going to help their faculty and students and this does that.

Motion: Accept proposal on ECS; motion carries unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #8 — Revision to the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy, #F11-241 to allow electronic WPAFs, from the Faculty Affairs Committee (first reading)

Sen. Hackenberg, FAC chair, moved to first reading; no second required because it comes from committee. Committee consulted with Maggie Beers and Brian Beatty on electronic WPAF's. The motion is to minimally amend the current RTP policy only to allow for E-WPAF's. Moving to electronic files is sustainable, facilitates process for candidates, saves space and reduces processing time for staff. We would like to minimally amend RTP policy so we can go ahead and create a portal. Recommended limit 1500 pages; change in lines 128-129 at faculty member's discretion. Timeline is for it to become available in Fall 2016.

Comments from Senators:

- RTP policy minimally added to or changed in any way; working in the dark because we don't know what architecture will look like. This is the most conservative policy in terms of not changing anything in policy.
- Upping stakes in producing electronic document; where does this body think the technical expertise is going to come from? Would like this to be an improvement or convenience.
- Rationale outlines tentative timeline for creating committee and building the system and simulating it before real candidates use it. Implementation committee formed in Spring 2015 and then simulation would occur. Optional at the beginning; use in Fall 2016.
- How will documents be archived, kept or destroyed? Line 349?

Dean Bunge is happy to provide training to facilitate process; can do a lot of that to make this a smooth transition for faculty.

Sen. Hackenberg- Paper documents currently go back to the candidate; will need to have a back up system for other electronic documents. Still debating on whether print documents will be available, and whether they should be downloadable due to confidentiality.

Policy change will return to committee and come back to floor on December 9th.

AGENDA ITEM #9 — Indicators and Standards of Program Success, Seventh Cycle Program Review, from the Education Policies Committee (first reading)

Motion comes from EPC, Sen. Gerber moved to first reading, does not need a second since it comes from committee. EPC met last week and voted 14-2 to move item to Senate. In response to 7th cycle, Senate charged with coming up with standards for program review. Provost Rosser created a task force over the summer, which included Jennifer Summit, Ann Hallum, Genie Stowers, Nancy Gerber, and Gail Dawson. Jennifer Summit went to college councils, made some revisions, and brought back to EPC for a vote. 7th Cycle standards look different from 6th Cycle because of changes in program review process and desire to make it valuable for departments to reflect on what they're doing and what they'd

like to be doing.

Comments from Senators:

- One question, Indicators and Standards #4 Faculty- last line. Unsure what that line means, what kinds of changes in the university? Sen. Gerber- final version is on iLearn, last week's Giants game destroyed the quorum! Group met and took an iLearn vote that wording should be changed regarding mission statement; too vague at this point.
- Sen. Wilczak- this document trying to focus on student reviews; supposed to be self-reflective program reviews. Trying to help departments be their best.
- Sen. Summit- relationship between assessment and program review- Division of Undergraduate Studies is where it's housed now. One of the goals of the task force to draft standards was to bring into closer alignment the assessment and program review, aligned with outside accreditation reviews as well. Student Learning Outcomes- every one to two years, programs assess quality of their students' learning in line with SLO's. How their students are meeting their own goals for their learning? Step back and assess quality of student learning goals themselves. Do they still line up with their sense of their mission as a department and the university as a whole? Did not discuss program prioritization.
- What is the role of librarians in curriculum review; also have another function of bibliographic instruction. How can librarians help programs in program review?

Sen. Summit- value of librarians and collections points to #5, Resources, think about them expansively. Handbook will follow this document and list library resources.

Sen. Gerber- answer lies in actual Handbook; some of these issues need to be discussed. Is there librarian on APRC now? That would be a good place to flesh out the role of the librarian.

Item will go back to committee and return to floor at future plenary.

AGENDA ITEM #10 — University Mission Statement, from the Strategic Issues Committee (first reading)

Sen. Vasche, SIC chair, moved to first reading, does not need a second. The slightly revised mission statement was fleshed out with some supporting language. Sen. Vasche will read document out loud.

Comments from Senators:

- Does what a mission statement should do, the best of what we aspire to. Comment on in "striving to be" everything, maybe the reach is a little too far. Line 33 as an example. Push too far and statement becomes empty. Like the tone of it overall.
- Thanks to the committee, this is difficult work. One purpose of mission statement is to act as a lodestar so we know if something is on or off mission. Helpful for committee to consider whether mission statement would guide us to determine whether we are on or off mission.

Sen. Vasche- to what extent does the mission statement guide us? Committee has been working in the dark since strategic plan has not been fully revealed to us yet. Have the core values as our guide but we are only one piece of the puzzle.

- Great tone, and appreciate the document. Propose that opening prepositional phrase not necessary; SF honors.... Might be stronger statement without that. Lines 40-41- sentence starting... acknowledge courage of our students. Other senators liked the tag line.
- Inconsistency with way SFSU is referred to, sometimes in third person, sometimes in first person.
- Invite committee to edit down the last four paragraphs. The mission statement is lines 30-35; first three lines the actual mission statement and subsequent wordage is supporting statements and an elaboration of the main body.
- Not obvious that the first paragraph is the mission statement, but a wonderful aspirational statement that doesn't provide the lodestar.
- If first four lines are actual mission statement, urge committee to put the phrase "social justice" in those four lines. This is very important to members of the university community.
- First statement fairly general and doesn't speak to SFSU being a unique institution; combined with first paragraph gives us a sense of who we really are.

- Our current mission statement on the website is solid and clear; don't know why we're doing a new one. Why the need for change?
 - Shawn Whalen- What exists on website is snapshot of what is larger mission statement; this body has to tackle the mission, hasn't been updated for a very long time. Long overdue that we revisit that mission statement.
- Mission statement should be the lodestar. Hope the language has some real teeth to it that inspires us around the social justice mission of our university.

Chair Getz- if strategic plan comes out in December, then mission statement will come out some time after that in the spring. Mission statement is much like a policy and must go to President Wong for signature.

AGENDA ITEM #11 — Adjournment—no later than 5:00p.m.

Chair Getz: Before we adjourn, want to applaud all committees for your hard work! No committee meeting next week (Veteran's Day)- see you on Nov. 18th.

Adjournment 3:45PM

Respectfully submitted by Eileen Levy, Secretary, Academic Senate

Meeting Date (Archive): Tuesday, November 4,
2014
